6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

517 668 to bring about an equalitarian and all-human brotherhood of men on a global scale. Seeking to realize these bi-polar objectives, the Bolsheviks have inherited and reinforced the basic contradictions and conflicts between the aspirations of the rulers and those of the subjects which have throughout centuries undermined the stability of Czardom.

668 661 In their effort to perpetuate themselves in power, the Bolsheviks had to remain organized as a ruling elite of professional conspirators and to reinforce dominance-submission relationships in a system of total power concentrated in their hands. To maintain such a political rule, the Bolsheviks had to introduce a system of total dependence of all upon the holders of power and thus to reinforce the attitudes of self-effacement. They also established a planned system of social differentiation and isolation to prevent social intimacy and group solidarity and hence the potentiality of organized opposition to their rule.

668 771 In such conditions, feelings of rejection and traditional longings for an equalitarian and all-human brotherhood of men have been greatly strengthened among the subjects. It is this situation that points out the fundamental weakness of the Soviet system. To counteract the effects of this basic vulnerability of their regime, the Bolsheviks have endeavored to deify the Soviet rulers, have resorted to the damnation and anathema of the Western world, and have embarked on a propaganda campaign for a Messianic redemption of all suffering and exploited humanity. In this manner, the Bolsheviks have been able to appeal to supra-ethnical and supra-personal loyalties and to all-human longings, not unlike a universal church.

[208] The Bolsheviks have also endeavored to build up the morale of their subjects by means of prestige projects, by mythical undertakings, by mass pageantry, mass unanimous voting and large scale militarization. All these devices are conceived as ways to provoke emotional identification of the masses with the Soviet State and to find in this identification a substitute for their yearnings for a community of free and equal men.

642 665 Total dominance and total submission relationships which have to be maintained to perpetuate this conspiratorial system of power have introduced other basic strains and stresses in the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

class the tendency was toward the concentration of power in the hands of the more mighty princes.[13]

This concentration of power in the hands of the city plutocracy found its expression in the principle of an unanimity vote in the city assembly (*Veche*). Data on the early political and social organization of the Russian urban communities show that the unanimity in decisions was the rule. The old documents about these gatherings tell us that "what has been established by the oldest city, is maintained by its boroughs," that "all thought and spoke as one man," that "all were unanimous in the desire," and that the decision was reached "by all the oldest and all the youngest men of the assembly."[14]

But we also learn that this unopposed group consensus was achieved by means of threat and terror against all those who might show an inclination to disagree or who disagreed after the assembly had been held and after a resolution had been passed. The dissenters were often beaten with rods, despoiled of their property, or murdered. Sometimes they might escape such fate if ready to pay a fine that varied according to the rank of the dissenter. In this manner a minority, backed by physical force was able to enforce its will on the rest under the guise of "unanimity."[15]

Pressure for the unanimous consent on the part of the people was applied also in the village assemblies, and later in the land commune (*mir*). In some other customs of the Great-Russian peasantry, even in our own times, the unanimous consent was considered necessary. In marriage ceremonies, for instance, custom demanded that the bride when leaving her parental home obtain blessing from all her neighbors. There was, however, a threat against neighbors who refused their blessing. Curses were invoked against them: "Those who do not bless her, may they never marry their sons and daughters" (*Kto ne blagoslovit tomu vek sinov ne zhenit a docheri za muzh ne vdavat*).[16]

The principle of unanimity was apparently the procedure in the local assemblies of the Old-Slavonic soil cultivators of the Dnieper river basin. Such an unanimity was also practiced until our times in the Zadruga society of Croatia.[17] But in those pacific and anarchic societies the principle of unanimity was real, not

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

a fiction. Lacking means of physical enforcement because of the lack of a centralized political system, common action could take place only among those who voluntarily agreed. But when small bands of mounted warriors imposed their rule over the multitudes of non-warlike peasantry, the power-oriented conquerors made use of the Old-Slavonic system of unanimity for purposes of regimentation and governmentalization from above. That is, they imposed a dictated consensus by means of force else the opposition of the peasant majority would soon have deprived the ruling minority of its power.

In this manner a number of band chieftains of nomadic origin ruled groupings of small peasant communities, in the form of manorial principalities. Each one of these local potentates, even though Slavicized in speech or born in mixed families, still exhibited extreme self-seeking characteristics and cherished personal power and aggrandizement above everything else, a tenet that had characterized his nomadic predecessors. Each, therefore, following steppe traditions, had a scheme of his own; each was interested primarily in accumulating riches for himself and his immediate family. In consequence, these local princes and their war bands constantly intrigued and fought among themselves. They also transferred their personal and factional strifes to the neighboring towns of burghers. In these squabbles and struggle for power and expansion, the feuding princes and fighting factions did not hesitate to call on the common enemies in their neighborhoods, such as the steppe marauders or the Viking pirates to come in and help them defeat their opponents.

It was in the course of such an internecine strife (*vsta rod na rod*) in Novgorod region in the middle of the ninth century that a band of Scandinavian merchant-pirates was called on to come and help one clique of native princes against the other.[18] These "Varangians" not only came in but stayed, founding later the Russian state in the Dnieper river basin, at that time the most important merchant thoroughfare in that part of the world. These Norse conquerors and state builders were soon assimilated by the natives. In the course of time a series of new principalities was formed and old factional bickerings and fratricidal warfare was renewed.[19]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

the mind of the burghers. As a result, the city folk changed their attitude and instead of haughty bearing they now "bow low" to Mikula.

Ilya of Murom, the other hero of peasant origin, is portrayed as "being crippled" for many years. Then suddenly he acquires gigantic strength from two sources: from psalm singers and from Svyatogor, a hero of supernatural origin and superhuman powers. By means of this acquired strength and by employing cunning, Ilya gets rid of Svyatogor and, like Mikula, joins the bandit-warriors. However, the professional warriors do not accept Ilya on equal terms because of his low origin. But by constant demonstration of superior physical strength employed as a means of intimidation Ilya is finally accepted by the ruling military aristocracy. After a terrifying demonstration of physical strength which shook the whole town to its foundation Prince Vladimir became so panicky that he hurried a messenger to humbly invite Ilya to a prince's feast:

> Knock upon the door five times
> Then cross yourself in the prescribed manner
> Make your bow as it is enjoined,
> Offer humble salutations, and beat with your forehead
> Upon the floor of bricks,
> Upon damp mother earth herself,
> Before the old Cossack, Ilya of Murom.[26]

It seems clear that in these two heroes of peasant origin we find reflected the vicissitudes to which the Old-Slavonic society has been exposed after it has been subjugated to warriors and traders. The moral and productive values of the peasants, symbolized by Mikula's strength, his skill in productiveness, his social responsibility and feelings of dignity and equality, were rapidly declining in the changing conditions. The peasants became an easy prey of the new ruling classes. The result was moral corruption on the part of the soil cultivators, disinterest in land, and an urge to revolt. The peasantry became "crippled." First they expected help from supernatural forces. Then finally they began to rely on guile and on terror to protect themselves. They realized that in the new political atmosphere it was superior physical force which was admired and respected. Many peasants

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

therefore were leaving the land to move to the cities or to join the bandits as traders and warriors.

These bandit-warriors are pictured in the Russian folk epic as ruling by such terrifying violence and dreadful terror and craft that all the living beings on the earth flee and hide, or lie prostrate, and even the earth itself shrinks and the sun sinks away at their appearance:

> The red sun was sinking
> Behind the dark woods, behind the broad sea,
> Multitudes of stars studded the clear sky
> When Lord Volga Buslavlevich was born
> In holy Russia.
> When Volga Buslavlevich was five years of age,[27]
> Lord Volga Buslavlevich went forth over the damp earth
> Damp mother earth was rent,
> The wild beasts fled away up to the clouds;
> And the fish scattered in the blue sea:
> And Lord Volga Buslavlevich went
> To learn all craft and wisdom,
> All the various languages;[28]
>
> Volga grew in strength and stature.
> He chose for himself a bold druzhina,
> Of thirty youths save one,
> He, Volga making the thirtieth.
> His dear 'uncle' bestowed upon him,
> Gracious Vladimir of Royal Kiev,
> Three cities with their peasants.[29]

The hero knights of these legendary *Byliny* (the events of the olden days) when they find themselves in circumstances which appear to be under their control, are likely to be boastful, quarrelsome, disrespectful, sensitive to rank and inclined to belittle the strength of their adversaries. In such circumstances they spend their time either in plundering, fighting, maiming and killing, or in feasting, debauchery, and drunkenness.[30]

The extreme power-compulsion and delusions of grandeur of these supermen, as well as their complete lack of self-control, are well symbolized in folk narratives about Svyatogor. This hero has an irresistible urge to bring the heaven and the earth to-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia: RF1

territories. He was adorned with the title of the "Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias,"[4] a symbolic beginning of Russian religious and political unity.

When the Tartars in the beginning of the thirteenth century imposed their overlordship over all Russian lands, lacking an efficient administration and interested not so much in governing as in tributes, they restored to the native princes their old titles and gave them the right to collect tributes for them. In this manner in the beginning of the fourteenth century Ivan Kalita of Moscow succeeded in obtaining a *yarlyk* (charter of privileges) in which the Tartar Kahn recognized Ivan as the *Veliky Knyaz* (Grand Prince). A few years later Ivan also became the chief collector of tributes for the Kahn in Russian lands.

In his function as chief farmer of internal revenues Ivan practiced extortion from his Russian subjects and acquired a great personal wealth. His riches enabled him to purchase entire domains and apanages, and to buy the protection and backing of the Kahn. Seeing the ascendency of Ivan, and following Byzantine traditions of Church and state unity, the Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias moved his residence to Moscow and built a cathedral there, ready to support Moscow princes in their political ambitions.

The expansion of Moscow's power over other Russian lands was favored also by external circumstances and pressures. By the second part of the fourteenth century the central authority of the Tartar Empire, the Golden Horde, had weakened and as was customary in Turco-Mongol society, civil wars ensued among the contenders for the throne. This situation presented an opportunity for power wise princes of Moscow to change their policy of cringing and prostration before the Tartars into that of rebellion and bargain. From now on at times they fought the Tartars, at other times they were again kneeling before them; but they now knew how to take advantage of Tartar weaknesses and how to gain new possessions with Tartar assistance. In this policy of expansion at the expense of other Russian principalities the Muscovites had the support not only of the Khans but that of the Eastern Orthodox clergy as well. Their

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

form an organized opposition; instead they fought among themselves over priority in rank and position (*mestnichestvo*), over estates and crownlands, and over the favors of the Czar.

The lack of unity and struggle for power existed also among the lesser nobility, most of whom obtained their rank not by right of inheritance but by the favor of the Czar or as a reward for their military services. Some of these service nobility were rich in vast possessions, others did not differ much from common peasants in the amount of land they possessed, in standard of living, and in formal education.

Internal squabbles among the landed magnates and the service nobility were weakening the strength of the Czardom in relation to its adversaries. This situation offered a strong argument in favor of the Czar's despotism and at the same time eased the crushing of the opposition in the interest of unlimited power. "If subjects submit not themselves unto their ruler, never shall strife cease in the land," said Ivan the Terrible.[9]

The best way to break the power of the landed aristocracy was by making them economically dependent upon the Czar. This objective was achieved in two ways. One was forceful expropriation, resettlement, imprisonment and assassination of recalcitrant boyars. The other consisted of the increased emphasis on *pomestie* system of conditional land tenure as against *votchina*, or hereditary land property.

According to the pomestie system, which followed Mongol traditions, the crown lands, together with the peasants settled on them, were donated to the holder of an office or of a military rank under the condition of obligatory and loyal service to the Czar, and only as long as the loyal service on the part of the land recipient lasted. The *pomeshchik* was obliged to provide a contingent of soldiers according to the size of his donation. This obligation devolved from father to son. The older sons would obtain from the Czar new pomesties and the youngest son would, as a rule, inherit the pomestie of his father.[10] In the Byzantine Empire, too, the land was given in reward for service, but there the land became hereditary property that could be disposed of at will by the holder. In Russia the system of conditional land ownership meant, like in the Mongol political system, complete

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of the Czar, they became increasingly rank-conscious, domineering and abusive toward all lower in rank or under their power.[12]

Such a ruling class, with its open misrule and arbitrariness, could not inspire the subjected classes with confidence and respect. The lack of social and political security was manifested in want of initiative, in disinterest in productive activities, in loose morals, in hazard games, in a low value of human life, and in a general lack of trust.[13]

On the other hand, perhaps as a reaction to these conditions of insecurity and of social disorganization, there was an urge of complete renunciation of the world and its strife, an urge to detach oneself from the group, a tendency to isolate oneself completely from human society and seek personal consolation and personal salvation in religion. This trend of social withdrawal and self-oriented feelings brought about a great development of hermitism and of monastic life. Many of these people, completely detached from human society and preoccupied exclusively with their own self, sought peace and communion with God in lonely, remote depths of forests, in the solitude of the wilds and deserts. Here "far removed from men" they spent their lives in prayer, fasting and self-maceration.

At the same time the masses of the people who lived in great misery and who were exposed to arbitrariness, exploitation, and other forms of oppression on the part of the mighty, sought consolation and hope in supernatural forces. Beliefs in miraculous powers of wonder-working icons and in life-giving properties of the Cross were taking deep roots. On all sides sprang up prophecies and apparitions. Saint men and prophets, often mentally unbalanced, would appear in the streets and openly voice their protest against the Czar and his government.[14]

These were the only signs of an open opposition to the existing system that was becoming increasingly unbearable. Such "idiots" were considered saintly by the people not only because of their strange behavior and their ability to endure extremes of hardship, but also for their unheard of courage to speak openly against the Czar:

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

subjects: coercion and dependency. One such method was to massacre a large part of the population, to loot the conquered territories, and to leave those that remained alive in abject misery. The plunder of the conquered peoples sometimes went to such extremes that they were exposed to prolonged famines and food had to be brought from Moscow to save the remaining populace from starving to death.

When a non-Russian territory had been brought to impotence by such means the Muscovite rulers would settle the Russian people among the natives, dividing the territory into a number of administrative units. The next step was to appoint persons who were strangers to those places to govern them. Following the Mongol pattern, these governors were changed often and never allowed to stay long enough to become friendly with the natives and to develop a genuine local power of their own. As a rule, in one and the same place two personages would be appointed, one of higher nobility to hold the office in name, and the other of lower nobility to control the former. Moreover, special overseers and watchdogs were periodically sent directly from Moscow to spy and check on both.[19]

This system of checking on persons who held high offices was practiced also in the army where large army units were headed by persons of the old high nobility, who were not trusted. To these nominal commanders, officers of lesser nobility would be appointed as deputy commanders. It was often these "political commissars" who had the real power.[20]

Just as in the tribes and states of the steppes the conquered people were kept in subjugation also by fomenting continual dissension between various classes and within each class of the population. The Czar at the same time relied on the numerical strength and loyalty of his personal guards and selected garrisons which were strategically distributed throughout the conquered country. The conquered people, brought thus by the conqueror to helplessness, fell to their knees and begged their overlords for mercy.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

643 imagine himself threatened by "enemies," and live in fear.[14] As
157 a defense against such feelings the Czar might be inclined to follow the advice of those of his officials who favored concentration of power and who advised against giving up any of his prerogatives or against any yielding to the demands of the opposition. "Constitution" to such a Czar and his camarilla was as dangerous as "revolution."

But such policies, which are rooted in a sense of extreme insecurity themselves tend to strengthen such feelings. Mistrust of people, fear of the "enemies," suppression of all opposition and tendency to concentrate increasingly the power in one's hands, to dominate and to demand absolute submissiveness is therefore perpetuated. Hence, power-relations in Russia of the eighteenth and nineteenth century tended to follow the pattern of rule established earlier in Muscovite Czardom:

661 The emperor Nicholas I ruled his country like a gamekeeper. Under
643 his administration of the empire, based as it was upon a system
566 of flogging, imprisonment, and exile to Siberia, the great could indulge their caprices with impunity . . . But . . . in reality . . . the masters were also slaves. Every man, whoever he might be, was dependent on someone more powerful than himself who could with impunity make him wretched, and over him again there was someone still mightier. The lord, it is true, lived in comfort, and the serfs in squalor, but that was all. They were all slaves, one as much as the other . . . I have seen both oppressors and oppressed at close quarters, and I can aver that the inhuman regime of bondage corrupted and depraved one as much as the other.[15]

625 Just as in the political organization of steppe nomads and in the Muscovite Czardom such relations of insecurity, mistrust, self-seeking, abusive domineering and blind subordination demanded an efficient system of watchfulness, vigilance, checking and counterchecking. A special attention therefore had to be paid to the institution of secret political police. Since the days of Czar Nicholas I, the secret political police, known as the Third Section, was placed above all ministries, and was directly subject to the Emperor himself, just as in the days of Ivan the Terrible. Like the Oprichniki of Ivan the Terrible the Third Section was the main agency of vigilance, the chief watchdog of the state. It

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

668 625 secret police had completely free hands in hunting down the members of the Terrorist movement, using the same cunning means as the terrorists did. Each party relied on terror, based on the principle that all means were justified. One of the principal victims in this struggle was Czar Alexander II whose ideas and policies were aimed at liberalizing the Russian society and raising it to the economic and educational level that had been achieved in the European West.

661 668 As a reaction against this event, Alexander's son and successor, Alexander III, instituted officially a regime of terror and declared a ruthless war of extermination of all terrorists and other subversive elements. The Russian public opinion, too, shocked by the assassination of Alexander II, was becoming alert to the dangers of terrorist practices.[29] Such circumstances had a disheartening effect on terrorist plans. A number of revolutionaries found it expedient to move the center of their activities to European capitals. Other young malcontents endeavored to "go among the people" (*iti v narod*) and start mass agitation and propaganda. These *Narodniki* wanted also to raise the educational and economic standards of the lower strata of the Russian society, particularly the peasants who were to play a significant role in the coming events.

16
THE STRUCTURE OF VILLAGE COMMUNITY

I

BEFORE serfdom, the land commune (*mir*) whose function was to distribute land periodically, to collect taxes and maintain order, was also an institution which protected its members from outside interference. It was an institution made up of peasants who were not differentiated economically and who knew their own needs and capacities. In such village communities the Old-Slavonic traditions of mutual aid and egalitarian

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

the communistic tenets of the Dukhobortsy in such a way as to turn them to his own profit and advantage. Like other Dukhobortsy, Kapustin too believed that God was in every man, and therefore all men were equal. He said, however, that God first had revealed himself in Jesus and the soul of Jesus has then continually animated new bodies throughout many generations. And by virtue of its higher qualities, and the absolute command of God, the soul of Jesus as it passed from one man to another had invariably retained its identity, and the man in whom the soul of Jesus resided, unmistakenly knew he was Jesus:

> Thus Sylvan Kolisnikof at Nikisk whom many of older among you knew, was Jesus; but now, as truly as the heaven is above and the earth under my feet, I am the true Jesus Christ, your Lord! fall down therefore on your knees and worship me![28]

Kapustin introduced a complete community of goods among his followers. They worked the fields in common and divided the harvest among them. Storehouses were erected to provide against years of dearth or famine. Also various kinds of industries were introduced and the colony showed visible progress in the first few years of its existence. Kapustin had also assembled an advisory Council of thirty Elders about him, from among whom an inner circle of twelve was selected. These were known as "The Apostles." Before he died he endeavored to impose his son as his successor and claimed that when he died the soul of Jesus would enter the body of his son.

After Kapustin's death dissatisfactions grew stronger and manifested themselves in suspicion, mistrust, and denunciation. The Council of Elders developed into an inquisitional tribunal which ruled arbitrarily, interpreting justice according to their caprices. Those who submitted unconditionally were rewarded, those who were suspected of deviation were accused of treachery and of intention to go over to their "enemy" that is, the official Church, and were punished with torture and even with death. The house from which the Elders ruled became known as *Ray i muka*—paradise and torture.[29]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

665

"Lenin always felt that the Party was he, that he was the will of the movement concentrated in one man, and he acted accordingly . . . "[8] It was this demand for total power and urge to perpetuate oneself in power that necessitated military discipline and frequent purges within the Party, just as earlier among the Terrorists, the same demand and urge fostered intolerance and hatred of all deviationists and outsiders, promoted mistrust and led to the use of terror inside and outside of Party ranks. Thus Lenin, too, approved of terror:

[661]

We have never rejected terror on principle, nor can we ever do so. Terror is a form of military operation that may be usefully applied, or may even be essential in certain movements of the battle. . . .[9]

Extreme power-seeking and resulting dogmatism and inability to compromise, as well as the example set by the Anarchists and Terrorists, led even in the early years of Party life to an emphasis on hatred of the opponents and on ruthlessness in dealing with them. Thus, in early Bolshevik writings, the words "hatred," "ruthlessness," "irreconcilability," "mercilessness," "relentlessness," "extermination," "destruction," "wiping off," became prominent. When called before the Central Committee of the Party to answer for his accusations against some Party members, which the Central Committee considered unjust and false, Lenin prided himself on using unethical methods in fighting his opponents. He proudly admitted that his accusations were deliberately schemed to:

. . . evoke in the reader hatred, aversion and contempt . . . calculated not to convince but to break up the ranks of the opponent, not to correct the mistake of the opponent but to destroy him, to wipe his organization off the face of the earth . . . to evoke the worst thoughts, the worst suspicions about the opponent . . . Against such political enemies I then conducted—and in the event of a repetition and development of a split shall always conduct a fight of extermination . . .[10]

It was this compulsive urge of the Bolsheviks to seize power by all and any means, their centralistic and military Party organization and their ruthlessness in dealing with their opponents that had enabled them to take advantage of the chaotic situa-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of foreign loans and investments the process of industrialization and of economic autarchy, which was needed to develop military potential necessary to withstand internal and external threats, was proceeding at too slow a pace. This situation made it imperative for the impatient and insecure ruling class to have at hand goods available for quick export in order to buy foreign machinery and to industrialize and militarize the country at a higher speed.

The peasants in the meantime were busy in making improvements on their possessions and in raising the amount of food for home consumption. Increased peasant consumption of food however meant decrease of the crops available both for export and for the needs of fast growing urban strata which were being created as a result of a speedy industrialization. Also lack of regulation of agricultural production meant that planting and sowing were designed to a large extent to satisfy the home needs of the peasant, and only to a lesser extent those of the national or foreign market.

This meant that as long as a large section of the peasantry remained as independent producers there was always a danger that the ruling class might not have at its disposal sufficient quantities of marketable products. And the more the ruling faction felt insecure in its power, the more this potential threat of an economically independent peasantry seemed real and close. This feeling of insecurity and mistrust of the Bolsheviks was manifested in their hatred of the peasantry. "The peasant who has two cows is already an enemy," they would say. Hence the Party hierarchy made the decision not only to abolish the economic independence of the peasants, but also to "destroy peasantry as a class" by means of collectivization.

In their determination to "destroy peasantry as a class," the Bolsheviks first incited the poor and the medium peasants against the "kulaks" and then the landless against the small peasant owners. The Bolshevik agitators took advantage also of the traditional tensions within peasant families and aroused son against father and brother against brother. Thus inciting and exploiting resentments and hostilities between various peasant strata and taking advantage of family antagonisms, the Bolsheviks were able

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

to force the peasants to join the collectives and the state farms. Those who opposed such policies were resettled or banished to convict labor camps. Many were massacred. According to Stalin ten million peasants became victims of this "class war."[5]

In order to insure their complete control over the farming population, the Bolshevik leaders sent the most trusted Party people from the city to the village to manage the newly formed *kolhozes*. These *novye bary* (new lords), as the peasants called them, installed themselves in the mansions of former estate owners and kept themselves at a considerable distance from the rural population, not unlike the former serf-owners. And not unlike the former gentry the new masters were also bent upon extracting maximum labor from the peasantry with minimum reward.

Under such conditions, the peasants, in the first outbursts of their reaction against this state of abusive submission resorted to outward aggression in the form of traditional uprisings. They burnt their crops and slaughtered their cattle rather than collectivize them. It is estimated that almost two-thirds of the entire livestock and a large part of the crops were destroyed.[6] Such a situation affected even the Ukraine, the "granary of Russia" and greatly contributed to the famine of 1932–33 in which hundreds of thousands of people died of starvation and epidemics. It was by such active rebellion that the peasantry forced the Party into a temporary retreat. The Party had to appease the peasants by giving each peasant household the right to retain in private use a small plot of land, and also in private possession a limited number of livestock. Also, private trade in agricultural products was restored in a limited degree.[7]

These were however only temporary concessions, since the Bolsheviks were determined to completely "industrialize" the peasantry as a means of political and economic control. Following such aims the highest possible degree of specialization in farm operation has been fostered and the members of the same family have been assigned to different, spacially separated activities. In this manner the agricultural brigade instead of the peasant family became the basic unit of agricultural production. For the same reason the highest possible degree of mechanization of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

This trend to expropriate the peasants and to overspecialize them as a means of political and economic control found its expression in the recent development of Bolshevik ideology. In the utterances of Party leaders and in the Soviet press it is being stressed that the conditions in the Soviet Union are already so advanced that the Soviet state is ready to move from socialism into the first levels of a limited Communism. This first phase of Communism will consist of the elimination of differences between industrial and agricultural work, between industrial workers and the peasantry ("Liquidating the contrast between the city and the village"). Thus it is pointed out, the old opposition between the country and the city will vanish and also cultural and psychological differences between these two strata will disappear. Every person will become engaged in a special "technical-engineering" task and all will be equal and like brothers.

As a result of such development, it is said that even the differences between the manual laborer and the intellectual worker will eventually be abolished and thus the classless and anarchic society envisaged in socialist writings and rooted in the traditions of the Slav culture will be finally achieved.[11] Productive forces will develop an abundance of all consumer goods whose distribution will be on the basis of exchange and according to one's needs. There will be no monetary relations and no differences in social status.

It is clearly and repeatedly emphasized, however, that nobody should mistake this change from socialism to communism as a "withering away" of the state. The state, say the Bolsheviks, must remain "strong" for the needs of defense,[12] until the Soviet system spreads over the entire earth.

II

Total power concentrated in the hands of Bolshevik conspirators as a means of perpetuation of their rule led to compulsory regimentation of all labor, to speed-up system, and to intensified differentiation in skill, income, and status within the working classes. The aim of these measures is to increase production and to control the working classes by breaking their group solidarity and by tying the laborer to his machine and the office worker to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his desk in the same way as the peasant has been bound to the land.[13]

The Party hierarchy has also passed a decree which enables the Party to keep the youth under its complete control. The decree orders mobilization of hundreds of thousand of Soviet youths to be trained annually as labor reserve. All those who go through such a training are "considered mobilized and under obligation to work four successive years in state enterprises in accordance with the directive of the general officer of Labor Reserves . . ."[14] Along the same lines of labor mobilization and economic regimentation a decree was passed according to which every skilled laborer, technician, engineer, and factory employee could be ordered moved from one factory to another in any location in the Soviet Union according to the needs of industrialization.[15]

In accordance with the need for total control of the working classes and of economic production the management of the factories was completely removed from the control or influence of the workers and centralized in the hands of the factory directors (*edinonachalie*). These became responsible for failure in output, for waste and for low quality of products. In such an industrial system the trade unions have become instruments of regimentation and speed-up. They ceased to be an institution for the protection of the rights and interests of the working class and instead evolved into an organization of overseers and labor drivers. The trade unions' Charter of 1949 expressly states this function:

> Mobilization of all factory workers and employees for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the production plan, for the strengthening of labor discipline, and for the development of socialist competition.
>
> Elaboration of practical measures for the stepping up of labor productivity, improvement of the quality of production, reduction of production costs, and raising of profitableness of the enterprise.[16]

In the same manner, one of the May Day slogans of 1952 reads: "Soviet trade unions! Develop socialist competition more widely for pre-schedule fulfillment of the state plan by every enterprise."

It was because of this need to regiment labor and make it com-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ment expense the Party recruits these in the first place from among specific categories of children, such as war orphans, illegitimate and delinquent children, and children of Party functionaries. Such children are considered to be most promising from the point of view of Party objectives.

It is mainly from the university student body that the new ruling classes and all needed experts of the Soviet Union are being recruited.[16] It is therefore of paramount importance that this reservoir of the ruling strata is kept well under control and that it is thoroughly ideologically indoctrinated and trained in unswerving loyalty and conformity to the Party. "Ideological training of Soviet students is a vital and integral part of all the work of district, city, province, and territory party committees."[17] It is therefore imperative that this body is highly selective and not overcrowded. Recruitment of university students from among higher classes and from selected categories of children serves well the Party objectives to perpetuate its power and to command unconditional submission of all to its will. Such policies also tend to solidify Soviet social structure along caste lines.[18]

III

The Bolsheviks have also employed other means to establish their absolute dominance. Following Anarchist precepts and practices, and driven by power-seeking and destructive aggression, they have justified a number of oppressive measures as being necessary "to hasten the liquidation of the capitalistic elements and to organize defense against capitalist encirclement which is as yet far from being, and will not soon be destroyed."[19] Their objectives were to be achieved not only by means of economic dependency, systematic indoctrination, planned social isolation and lack of trust, but also by means of relentless vigilance and systematic terror.

One of the most important instruments of such policies have been the courts of law. Soviet socialist law is defined as the "totality of the rules of conduct, established in the form of legislation—to the end of annihilating, completely and finally, capitalism and its survival in the economy, manner of life,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 · RF1 Great Russia RF1

chooses to consider that the interests of the children have not been safeguarded.[5] In such cases parental rights might be lost for up to five years.[6] According to the Soviet educational philosophy it is expected that the parents will *rear* the children, but that the public organizations under the Party's supervision will instruct and supervise parents in the ways of *Communist upbringing* of children.[7]

The Party considers it to be its duty to arouse antagonism of children against parents when such action is necessary in the interest of the survival of the Soviet regime. As mentioned earlier, planned rift between fathers and sons was, for instance, employed to speed up the process of collectivization. Commissar of Agriculture Jakovlev, speaking before a Party congress on the struggle against the kulaks, stated that "In a number of cases, the children of the kulaks are made to revolt against their parents, and thus the kulak families are divided and the kulaks still more isolated." The Party has also been known to take advantage of family conflicts to encourage the children to spy on their parents and to denounce them to the political police:

> Russian parents had to be very careful of what they said in the presence of their own children, and even of how they disciplined their children. One boy, Pavlik Morosov, was built up as a hero among youth because he had denounced his father who was organizing resistance against the kolhoz. Great propaganda was made about this boy. A book was written about him. Actually he became a hero to most children.[8]

In times of political "purges" there were frequent notices in the Soviet papers in which the children of the parents who were politically persecuted publicly renounced their parents.[9] That was the only way they could escape the vengeance of a regime which had revived the tradition of family hostages and used it as an instrument of political conformity.

The Bolsheviks consider that since "one's way of life is a social matter . . . a matter of national policy,"[10] the Party has the right to interfere even in pre-marital and extra-marital sex relations, as well as in the relations between the spouses. "Young Communist organizations cannot remain neutral when the con-

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Many observers of Soviet society have noticed that in this constant struggle for power, and sometimes in order to save their very lives, Soviet officials and intellectuals must be ready not only to inform on each other, but also to "throw mud" at the closest associates and friends as soon as these happen to fall in disgrace.[1] Denunciation of a friend is often "the best way out of a hole," they say. Many "pretend to deny and to disown those who fall in disgrace" or, frightened, "join in verbal lynching to protect themselves." There is a "malignant joy regarding a comrade's mistakes . . . exaggeration of mistakes."[2] They "rush to kick a man who is already down, to push him over the precipice." In such conditions "Friendship is strained with blood and betrayal; it is an object of fear and suspicion."[3] Even members of one's own family might be repudiated under such pressure.[4] At the same time the need for cringing before one's superiors is often compensated by arrogance, capriciousness, arbitrariness, insulting and humiliating treatment of his subordinates or of all unprotected.[5]

The sense of guilt, insecurity, and feelings of humiliation which develop in such circumstances are magnified by means of social isolation. This isolation is manifold in the Soviet society, especially in the upper ruling strata. Intimate personal contact and unfettered social and intellectual intercourse is officially frowned upon and is therefore very limited among the Party, Army, government and managerial hierarchies. Intimate fraternization with associates is looked upon with great suspicion in a society whose ruling minority maintains itself in power by means of planned social divisions and mistrusts. Said Stalin: ". . . such family conditions create a favorable environment for the nurture of reptiles, not Bolsheviks."[6]

Real risks are involved in any free discourse in a society which is infested with watchdogs and informers and in which many are inclined to seek self-advance in the ruin of others. In the upper strata besides fear, suspicion and need for extreme caution, there is lack of intimate contact also because of sharp differentiation in rank. For the same reasons intercourse between the educated and non-educated strata has to be kept to a minimum.

There is also a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling class

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

517 newspapers, books, and pamphlets, some of which were printed
204 abroad and circulated freely though often clandestinely among
626 the leading circles of the Empire.

517 The ruling circles of the Bolshevik Party themselves were
626 always aware that without criticism intellectual stagnation, lack of creative initiative, and bureaucratism would set in. But they could not afford to allow complete freedom of thought and of expression which might eventually undermine their own power. As a result the Bolsheviks introduced a system of "criticism and self-criticism," known as *samokritika.*

[461] According to this practice it is the duty of every Soviet subject to criticize his own work and the work of others in his shop or office as a means of stimulating alertness, initiative, and hard
[557] work, and as a way to correct errors. But among the officials who
[647] closely watch each other's activities, each hoping to rise on the cadaver of the other, samokritika is often used as a means of intrigue and ruin in jockeying and struggling for ranks, positions, and power. Samokritika therefore has developed into a weapon employed to detect the ideological deviations and diversions and to criticize any lack of sufficiently positive attitude toward the "Party line." In this manner "self-criticism" in the Soviet Union has become another instrument of regimentation and means to increase conformity.

626 Samokritika is also employed by the ruling circles to manipu-
● 661 late hostilities generated by the Soviet system and to direct them away from themselves and against the managers and bureaucrats located mostly on the lower levels of the Soviet social pyramid. These people conveniently function as scapegoats. It is such people who, together with a sprinkling from the higher echelons, are periodically offered as sacrifice and "purged" or "liquidated." Samokritika is therefore employed also as a check against abuses of power, though mostly on the local level.

626 In an atmosphere of complete dependence upon and subordi-
154 nation to an overwhelming and infallible power which instils
782 fear and awe, the slightest deviation from the line of thought and emotions as laid down by that distant and inscrutable force might easily provoke anxieties, and a strong sense of guilt. In circumstances in which one feels isolated and without support,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

one's helplessness, feeling of rejection, and dependence upon the controlling power is especially keenly felt. In such conditions even a slight deviation might provoke a feeling of guilt, need for self-punishment and suffering; it might call for public self-humiliation, confession of errors and pledges to repent and to correct the wrong done, especially when such practices are supported by the inherited traditions. There is therefore a certain degree of truth in the assertion of the Bolsheviks, that "Criticism and self-criticism is a great driving force in the development of Soviet society."[10]

II

In a "prison and barracks" society privileges of power and ideas of grandeur do not sufficiently compensate for lack of acceptance, isolation, humiliations, feelings of insecurity, and sense of inferiority and rejection. In an atmosphere of suspicion, intrigue, degradation, and lack of intimate personal and intellectual contact and of social support, anxieties, fears, extreme self-concern, and deep antagonisms easily flourish. Such a situation tends to magnify feelings of destructive aggression developed on the family level and is therefore likely to become overcharged with extreme hostilities and hatreds; it is likely to become full of potential explosiveness which may be directed against the ruling class itself unless convenient channels for discharge of aggressiveness are found.

In a society in which overt expressions of emotional behavior are under the control of a ruling clique, accumulating aggressions are readily directed against internal and external "enemies" of the regime, be they real or invented for the occasion. In this manner the feeling of hostility against the regime might be redirected against its opponents. It is therefore in the interest of survival of the ruling faction in such a society to cultivate hatred and destruction of the "enemy" by all means of public pressure, propaganda, agitation, education, as well as lawmaking.

These are the reasons why attitudes of extreme animosity against the "enemies of the Soviet Motherland" are propagated in the Soviet daily press and in the school textbooks. Stirring hatreds is one of the main tasks of Party agitators.[11] Accordingly

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

author, wrote a well known poem under the title *"Ubey ego"*—kill him.[14] In a similar manner Alexey Tolstoy, a well-known Soviet novelist, has published an essay entitled *Ubey Zverya*—Kill the Beast. "Kill him," writes Alexey Tolstoy, "that is your sacred command."[15] Mikhail Sholokhov, another prominent Soviet writer, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Nauka Nenavisti*—The Science of Hatred—in which he stressed, in a like way as the early Russian Anarchists and contemporary Soviet pedagogists, the necessity of ardent love for the Cause as a source of passionate hatred of all the opponents. To him, too, love seems to be necessary primarily as a means of hate.[16] "Hatred for enemies of the land of socialism is an inseparable feature of socialist ideology and the ideology of Leninism," the Bolsheviks repeatedly say.

Under the label "enemies" are classed not only the foreign "capitalists, imperialists, and reactionaries," and internal non-Party oppositionists, but also Party members who deviate from Party ideology, and "all sceptics, opportunists, capitulators, scabs, and traitors." Hatred and struggle against these "enemies" within the Party must be as merciless and ruthless as against external adversaries. This is considered to be imperative in a mortal struggle against the capitalist world:

> The history of the Party . . . teaches us that unless the Party of the working class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst . . . it cannot perform its role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution . . . If, while it is carrying on a life and death fight against the bourgeoisie, there are capitulators and traitors on its own staff, within its own fortress, the working class will be caught between two fires, from the front and the rear. Clearly such a struggle can only end in defeat.[17]

This conscious fomenting of intense hostility and animosity against internal, as well as external "enemies" as a means of survival in a "mortal struggle" is manifested in the language of Bolshevism. The words "liquidation" and "purge" which are often synonomous with killing and extermination of opponents became outstanding in Soviet vocabulary. There is an increasing use of words which convey ideas of hatred and violence and stimulate such feelings and practices. In Bolshevik stereotyped termi-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

nology opponents are referred to as the "enemies of the people." They are said to be "groups of spies," "traitors to the country," "dregs of humanity," "fiendish criminals," "pigmies," "useless rubbish," "hordes of barbarians," "hangmen," "cannibals," "enemies of humankind."[18] These "instruments of oppression of the proletariat," full of "falsehoods and perverse lies," "narrow-minded petty-bourgeois with sickly mentality," have to be mercilessly "smashed," "annihilated," "crushed," "destroyed" with an "ever greater frenzy and ferocity."[19] They have to be "cleansed" from the Soviet society in order to ensure the consolidation of the rule of the Bolsheviks.

It was in order to justify ruthlessness in dealing with the opposition that labelling, denouncing and name-calling has become prominent in Bolshevik practices. Any softness toward the "enemies" is denounced as bourgeois "sentimentalism."[20] Instead, *besposhchadnost* (mercilessness), *surovost* (ruthlessness), *besstrashie* (fearlessness), and *zheleznaya volia* (iron will) are said to be the "Lenin ways" by which the political workers are to deal with all the "opponents, slackers, and deviants."

If in this "life and death fight," ruthlessness, pitilessness, and mercilessness have to be applied then also cunning, guile, craft, ruse and deceit are equally welcome as useful means. Lenin is often quoted as saying that the Communists, when necessary, must "resort to strategy and adroitness, illegal proceedings, reticence and subterfuge,"[21] that they must use any trick and veiling of truth; that they must dodge and maneuver. They must be ready in the interest of final success to suffer humiliation and self-abasement. In the interest of the cause and of final victory, they must know how to retreat and how to "crawl in the mud on their bellies."[22] According to the Bolshevik teaching, there is not an "absolute ethic." Every act is measured by how it corresponds to the interests of the group.[23]

III

Emphasis on extreme hatred, on ruse, and on mercilessness against those who do not conform is not new in the history of Russian society. Destructive aggression formed an aspect of the Czarist rule; it was manifested in the persecution of religious

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

dissenters, in the civil wars as well as in the struggle between the Czarist police and the revolutionary intelligentsia; it was even formulated as an ideology and became a credo of Anarchism.

In the Bolshevik ideology this anti-humanism is justified by representing the "enemies" as not being human beings. Just as in the folk attitudes toward enemy aliens, the oppositionists and the adversaries, actual and potential, real and imaginary, are identified in Bolshevik writings with "gnats," "insects," "reptiles," "dogs," "wild beasts," and "beasts of prey." It is by such ways of reasoning that the Soviet pedagogists have come to the assertion that indoctrination of the people with "burning hatred" of the enemy does not contradict the ideas of humanism, because, they claim, the ideas of humanism and humane feelings do not apply to beasts. In this manner even acts of cruelty toward the "enemies" are condoned and encouraged:

> Hatred of the enemies of the socialist Motherland by no means contradicts the principles of humanism, since it is devoted to the protection of the rights and liberty of the worker from the designs of beasts of prey.[24]

The need for such an appeal to extreme animosities against the adversaries is in itself an indication of instability of the Bolshevik system. The ruling faction had to resort to such a means in order to promote complete identification with and fanatical devotion to the Cause and to the Leader. Here, however, we see a noticeable difference between the Czardom and the Soviet Russia. Though the Czarist system often exhibited aspects of extreme ruthlessness, the whole ideological and intellectual development of the Czarist Russia, especially in the last century of its existence, was in the direction of increasing Westernization and humanization. This trend coincided with certain gains in the field of personal, economic, and cultural freedoms in the Czardom.

As a result terrorism and acts of violence, though widely practiced, were not openly advocated as official Czarist policy. Many moderate and conservative factions of the intelligentsia strongly denounced all acts of terror performed either by the government or under the auspices of the revolutionary intelligentsia. One

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of the outstanding tenets in the philosophy of Russian monasticism whose history is even longer than that of the Czardom was charitable love. Many sects of the *Raskolniki* propagated and practiced principles of humaneness. The Slavophils were especially prominent in advocating the return to an idealized stateless society of benevolent paternalism where brotherhood, Christian love, and compassion would reign. The "Westerners" endeavored to introduce into Russia Western concepts of justice and tolerance, and a humanistic, libertarian and juridical state. Russian belles-lettres, Russian school textbooks, as well as laws and regulations in the nineteenth century and up to the beginning of World War I, bear witness to this trend toward Westernization and humanism.

In Soviet Russia, on the other hand, after a brief initial period of reaction against the old regime which led toward an emphasis on all-human values and equalitarian brotherhood, soon the trend of events pushed the Bolshevik ideology in the opposite direction. The determination of a ruling clique of professional conspirators to maintain themselves in power by any and all means dictated the emphasis on the internal and external "threats" which would justify the intensification of internal "measures of security," and of external aggression. Thus vigilantism and war preparedness, and expansion of internal and external Bolshevik power, became the main base of the policies of the ruling class.[25] Such policies had to be constantly reinforced by a deliberate incitement to hatred and destruction.

The image of Soviet society as being in a constant state of war, not only against foreign enemies but against internal oppositionists, deviationists, spies, saboteurs, and remnants of bourgeois mentality has been determined by a social structure which the Bolshevik rulers themselves have created, but which makes their own power uncertain and precarious. In such circumstances Lenin's idea of a life and death struggle with the "class enemies," the idea that "it's them or us" (*Kto kogo*) has provided the main motivating force of the Party's internal and foreign policies. Fearing to be annihilated unless they themselves destroy their enemies, conscious that they have "either to rule or to die," the Bolsheviks have ruthlessly applied the principle of "obedience

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

or death" (*povinovenie ili smert*) in their rule; thus terror has become one of the main instruments of their power.

But once self-seeking careerists and fanatical devotees, specialists in violence, conspiracy and vigilance take into their hands the reins of a society which they indoctrinate with hatred and ruthlessness, the value of human life tends to be greatly lowered. In their constant struggle for survival, fear-ridden and extremely insecure, these people are forced to adopt an attitude of expendability toward all their subjects, just as earlier the Anarchists and Terrorists considered that all their members were only capital to be freely spent in the interest of the revolution.

In such conditions the disregard for individual rights and needs, and lack of consideration and of human feeling become generalized and are applied not only in dealings with enemies, but also in relations with associates, relatives, friends, allies and subjects in general whenever the vested interests of the ruling clique are threatened. The orders and the plans must be fulfilled; the victories must be made no matter what the cost in personal freedom and dignity, human suffering and human lives, because it is these orders, plans, and victories upon which the survival and the perpetuation of the ruling faction depends. All those who are in the way must be unconditionally sacrificed. Said Stalin:

> . . . it [is] easy to be a hero or a great leader if one had to do with the people such as the Russians . . . even persons of medium courage and even cowards became heroes in Russia. Those who do not . . . are killed.[26]

This attitude of disregard and contempt for human life when the survival of the ruling class and its vested interests are in question was expressed by Stalin also in his known interview with G. B. Wells. The magnitude of convict labor establishments, the police practices, and the extent of economic and other deprivations to which the Soviet subjects are exposed are all manifestations of this frame of mind.

The low value which is placed on human life in Bolshevik ideology is especially well demonstrated in war times. The Soviet armed forces command does not assess the cost of war in terms

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

reason or another feel rejected, non-accepted, humiliated, oppressed or ostracized in their own society and who find in these parties an opportunity to vent their accumulated grievances and pent-up hostilities. But they also tend to attract people who for idealistic and humanistic reasons seek Utopias of all-human brotherhood. They attract ambitious and talented intellectuals and semi-educated people who have been thwarted in their professional and political expectations; also intellectuals and semi-intelligentsia with mediocre abilities but strong urges for self-assertion and desire for leadership and domination. They also attract many patriots belonging to oppressed nationalities or races, who have identified themselves with their nation, race or ethnic and cultural minority and seek acceptance of their group in a Communistic millenium. In times of social upheavals these parties attract also many adventurers, criminals, vagabonds, and other deviants and offenders.

It is, however, people overcharged with destructive aggression who in these parties tend to climb toward the top levels of Party leadership, because it is such people to whom the Party offers great opportunities for their destructive urges and who therefore tend to be unconditionally loyal to Moscow as contrasted to the more moderate and more humane and patriotic elements, who for one reason or another might not want always to accept Moscow's dictate. As a result of such internal conditions the history of all Communist parties has been a history of internal intrigues, splits, purges, and frequent bloodshed which in turn made it easier to completely subdue these organizations to the will of the Kremlin:

> . . . those who disorganize the Party are to be flayed without mercy. Championing as we do working class unity, we shall with so much more energy and irreconcilability fight for unity within our Parties. There can be no room in our Parties for factions, or for attempts at factionalism. Whoever will try to break up the iron unity of our ranks by any kind of factionalism will get to feel what is meant by the Bolshevik discipline that Lenin and Stalin have always taught us (applause) . . . *The Party is above everything else!* (Loud applause) To guard the Bolshevik unity of the Party as the apple of one's eye is the first and highest law of Bolshevism![20]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

vising, checking and controlling. Accordingly just as in the Soviet Union in each satellite country primary attention is paid to the personnel policies. "Department of Cadres" and "Personnel Bureaus," headed by people who are trusted friends of the Soviet Union and advised by Soviet experts, supervise the political reliability and the labor efficiency of all. Observers of these agencies and Soviet experts are at work in every Party organization, every office and every factory shop. The hiring, releasing, and transferring of personnel rests with these bureaus.

In all these considerations political reliability and not professional competence is of foremost importance, a situation that favors the rise of professionally incompetent zealots and careerists ahead of people who are professionally able but more cautious and moderate, or more independent.[44] In consequence, just as in the Soviet Union, there is a keen struggle for positions and ranks and there is a premium on specialists in political organization and violence, a great demand for watchdogs, agitators, overseers and labor-drivers. Unconditional faith in and devotion to Russia is considered, however, to be the first and primary prerequisite for advance in satellite political, military and managerial hierarchies.[45] Hence periodical purges or "verifications" of Party members are undertaken to insure that only sufficiently Russified people remain in the Party.

The need of total control of dependencies dictates also a divide and rule policy among the satellites. In accordance with such policies the Kremlin instigates and encourages local nationalisms, regionalisms and separatisms and external aggressiveness of the satellites while at the same time it must prevent pan-movements and excessive territorial ambitions which might challenge the dominance of Moscow. Thus while instigating Asiatic nationalism the Soviet Union must prevent the championship of the Pan-Mongolian idea by Mongolia or Communist China. While encouraging various Balkan nationalisms it had to prevent the formation of a South Slav Federation.

Another means of promoting effective control of and dominance of the satellites is isolating these vassal countries from the West and therefore preventing any Western influence to undermine Bolshevik rule. This aim is achieved by deliberately pro-